

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are divided into the following Groups:

Group I: Claims 15-28, drawn to a cosmetic article.

Group II: Claim 29, drawn to a process of using a cosmetic article.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 15-28, for examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the identified groups.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required (MPEP §803). The burden is on the Examiner to provide reasons and/or examples to support any conclusion in regard to patentable distinction (MPEP §803). Moreover, when citing lack of unity of invention in a national stage application, the Examiner has the burden of explaining why each group lacks unity with each other group specifically describing special technical features in each group (MPEP § 1893.03(d)).

The Office has asserted that Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1, because under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. The Office has stated:

“The special technical feature of a fibrous support material which is not soluble in a first temperature and which shrinks at elevated temperature and which is soluble in a second water temperature is shown in US Patent No. 5,208,104 . . .”

Annex B of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT at (b) Technical Relationship states:

“The expression “special technical features” is defined in Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that defines a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings (if any).”

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not provided any indication that the contents of the claims interpreted in light of the description was considered in making the assertion of a lack of unity and therefore has not met the burden necessary to support the assertion.

Furthermore, 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b) states in pertinent part:

“An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

(2) A product and a process of use of said product; . . .”

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not considered the relationship of the inventions of Groups I and II with respect to 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b)(2).

Moreover, Applicants respectfully refer to Annex B of the Administrative Instructions Under the PCT, paragraph (c), which states in part, “Unity of invention has to be considered in the first place only in relation to the independent claims in an international application and not the dependent claims.” Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 29 depends directly from Claim 15 in this application.


Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the requirement for restriction.

Applicants therefore request that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



---

Jay E. Rowe Jr., Ph.D.

Registration No. 58,948

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)